

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARIMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexachia, Vignia 22313-1450 www.nspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/662,219	09/14/2000	09/14/2000 Kei Yoshikawa		9438	
22852	7590 07/14/2003				
	I, HENDERSON, FAI	EXAMINER			
LLP 1300 I STRE	ET, NW	AHMED, SAMIR ANWAR			
WASHINGT	ON, DC 20005	1	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		•	2623	1	
			DATE MAILED: 07/14/2003	4	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

		\$ '	<u>774</u>	mea	2625	
	- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears	on the cover s	sheet	with the corres	pondence address	:
Period f	for Reply					
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the						
mailing	date of this communication.					
- If NO	period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply	and will expire SIX ((6) MOI	NTHS from the meilir	ng date of this communic	ation.
 Faiture 	to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause t ply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of	he application to be	come A	BANDONED (35 U.S	S.C. § 133).	
	patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	tius continuidation,	, 000	turni, mod, may re	3333 S.,,	
Status						
1) 🗆	· ·					•
2a) 🗌	This action is FINAL . 2b) This ac					
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.					merits is	
Disposit	tion of Claims					
4) 🕅	Claim(s)			is/are	pending in the a	pplication.
. 4	a) Of the above, claim(s)5			is/ar	e withdrawn from	n consideration.
	Claim(s)					
6) 🔯	Claim(s) $1 - 4 / 6 - 14$				is/are rejected.	
7) 🗀	Claim(s)				is/are objected to	
8) 🗆	Claims	a	re su	bject to restric	ction and/or elect	ion requirement.
Applica	tion Papers					
9) 🗆	The specification is objected to by the Examiner.					
10)□	10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.					
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the					
11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner						
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.						
12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.						
Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120						
13) Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).						
a) All b) Some* c) None of:						
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.						
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No.						
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). *See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 						
14) Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).						
a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.						
15) Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.						
Attachment(s)						
_	errits; tice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) M Interview	Summa	ry (PTO-413) Paper	No(s). 24	
_	tice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)			Petent Application		
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s)						
71	3					

Art Unit: 2623

7 A .. 4

Restriction

1. This application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species of the claimed invention: shown by different figures and embodiments, species I includes claims 1-4, 6-14, species II includes claim 5

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. Currently, no claim is generic.

Applicant is advised that a reply to this requirement must include an identification of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

During a telephone conversation with Richard V. Burgujian (#31,744) on 7/11/03 a provisional election was made without traverse to prosecute the invention of species I, claim 1-4,
 6-14. Affirmation of this election must be made by applicant in replying to this Office action.
 Claim 5 is withdrawn from further consideration by the examiner, 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being

Art Unit: 2623

drawn to a non-elected invention.

3. Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(I).

4. Claim 1 is objected to for minor informality, on line 16, "dividing the variation curve for intersection parts' should be changed to --dividing the variation curve per intersection parts--.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

- 5. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:
 - The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.
- 6. Claims 1-4, 6-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for "dividing the line width variation amount per design grid width w. Then extracting intersections between the design grid width and the variation curve. Then dividing the space width s per intersection parts" (page 13, line 27-page 14, line 8), does not reasonably provide enablement for "dividing the variation curve per design grid width and extracting intersections between the design grid width and the variation curve; dividing the variation curve for intersection parts and establishing a correction rule for correcting" as recited in claim 1. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or

.

Art Unit: 2623

ar t . .

with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims. Because the variation curve has two axis, the line width variation amount and the space width, one of ordinary skill in the art would not be able to determine wether to divide the line width variation amount or the space width per design grid width w to extract intersections between the design grid width and the variation curve. Furthermore the specification as recited above only dividing the line width variation amount per design grid width w and extracting intersections between the design grid width and the variation curve. No embodiments are disclosed that enable dividing the space width s per design grid width w and extracting intersections between the design grid width and the variation curve.

As for claims 2-4, 6-14 refer to claim 1 rejection.

7. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

8. Claims 1-4, 6-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 1, recites "establishing a correction rule for correcting, integer times the design grid width with respect to each of the intersection parts" on lines 17-18. It is not clear wether the correction rule for correcting, is set to integer times the design grid width with respect to each of the intersection parts or the correction rule correct the design grid width with respect to each of the intersection parts an integer times. Applicant has to clarify that.

Art Unit: 2623

As to claims 2-4, 6-14 refer to claim 1 rejection.

- 9. Claims 1-4, 6-14 would be allowable if overcome the 112, first and second paragraph.
- 10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Samir Ahmed whose telephone number is (703) 305-9870. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday from 8:00 AM to 4:30 PM. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Amelia Au, can be reached on (703) 308-6604. The fax phone number for this Group is (703) 872-9314. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-4700.

SA

07/11/03

SAMIR AHMED PRIMARY EXAMINER

Intervious Summans	09/662219 Kei Yoshika wa etal				
Interview Summary	Examiner Sight Art Unit 2623				
All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):					
11) Richard V. Burgijan					
	(4)				
Date of Interview	_				
Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference c) ☐ Personal (copy is given to 1) ☐ applicant	2) applicant's representative)				
Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d)	e) No. If yes, brief description:				
Claim(s) discussed: 1-14					
Identification of prior art discussed:					
Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached substance of Interview including description of the general any other comments:	al nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or				
(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.) i) It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview (if box is checked). Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached					
Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.	Examiner's signature, if required				

÷ >, .